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This article describes the current most precise measurement of the WZ production cross section as well as limits on anomalous WWZ couplings at a center-of-mass energy of 1.96 TeV in proton-antiproton collisions for the Collider Detector at Fermilab (CDF). WZ candidates are reconstructed from decays containing three charged leptons and missing energy from a neutrino, where the charged leptons are either electrons or muons. Using data collected by the CDF II detector (7.1 fb\(^{-1}\) of integrated luminosity), 63 candidate events are observed with the expected background contributing 8 ± 1 events. The measured total cross section \(\sigma(p\bar{p} \rightarrow WZ) = 3.93^{+0.60}_{-0.53}(\text{stat})^{+0.59}_{-0.46}(\text{syst}) \text{ pb}\) is in good agreement with the standard model prediction of 3.50 ± 0.21. The same sample is used to set limits on anomalous WWZ couplings.
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The measurement of WZ production is an important test of the standard model (SM) of particle physics. WZ pairs are produced both in \(s\)-channel \((q\bar{q} \rightarrow W^+ \rightarrow WZ)\) and in \(t\)-channel \((q\bar{q} \rightarrow WZ)\) interactions. The WZ production is unique in that the \(s\)-channel mode of production provides sensitivity to the WWZ vertex, which is governed by triple-gauge boson couplings (TGCs); the presence of anomalous couplings \([1]\) could be an indication of new physics at a higher mass scale leading to different rates and kinematic distributions than predicted by the SM. Furthermore, this process is an essential background for Higgs boson searches at particle colliders because the WZ decay into leptons is the primary background to high mass Higgs boson searches in the three-lepton signature, as well as an important background process in two-lepton Higgs boson analyses \([2]\).

This article reports a measurement of the WZ production cross section and limits on anomalous TGCs using a final state consisting of three charged leptons and one neutrino, where the charged leptons are either electrons or muons—these events are considered part of the SM. All results reported measurements consistent with the standard model. This analysis describes CDF’s most precise measurement of the WZ cross section and TGCs.

In the CDF II detector \([14]\), a particle’s direction is characterized by the azimuthal angle \(\phi\) and the pseudorapidity \(\eta = -\ln[\tan(\theta/2)]\), where \(\theta\) is the polar angle measured with respect to the proton beam direction. The transverse energy \(E_T\) is defined as \(E \sin \theta\), where \(E\) is the energy in the electromagnetic and hadronic calorimeter towers associated with a cluster of energy deposition. The transverse momentum \(p_T\) is the particle’s momentum component transverse to the beam line. The magnitude of the \(p_T\) for an electron is scaled according to the energy measured in the calorimeter in order to account for momentum loss from final state radiation and bremsstrahlung.

The missing transverse energy vector \(\vec{E}_T\) is defined as \(-\sum_i E_T^i \vec{n}_T^i\), where the index \(i\) loops over all towers of the calorimeter and \(\vec{n}_T^i\) is the unit vector in the transverse plane pointing from the interaction point to the energy deposition in calorimeter tower \(i\). The \(\vec{E}_T\) is corrected for the \(p_T\) of muons, which do not deposit all of their energy in the calorimeter, and tracks that point to uninstrumented regions in the calorimeter. The scalar missing transverse energy is defined as \(|\vec{E}_T|\) and denoted as \(E_T\). Strongly interacting partons produced in the \(p\bar{p}\) collision undergo fragmentation that results in highly collimated jets of hadronic particles. Jet candidates are reconstructed using the calorimeter signals and are required to have \(E_T > 15\) GeV and \(|\eta| < 2.5\). Isolated lepton candidates are accepted out to an \(|\eta|\) of 2.0 for electron candidates and \(|\eta|\) of 1.0 for muon candidates.

The experimental signature for the decay \(WZ \rightarrow l\nu ll\) is reconstructed as three charged leptons (electrons or muons) and \(\vec{E}_T\) from the neutrino(s) that escaped undetected. Events are also detected if the \(W\) or \(Z\) decays to tau lepton(s) and those tau(s) subsequently decay to detectable electrons or muons—these events are considered part of the signal. Consequently, events containing three charged leptons, not all with the same charge, are selected from the data sample. The online event triggering and selection of
lepton candidates are identical to those used in the search for SM Higgs bosons decaying to two W bosons at CDF [2]. Our baseline event selection is to require the leading lepton’s $E_T$ (or $p_T$ for muons) to be above 20 GeV (GeV/$c$) to satisfy the trigger requirements, while the second and third leptons are allowed to have an $E_T$ ($p_T$) as low as 10 GeV (GeV/$c$). Additionally, because the neutrino in the $W \rightarrow l\nu$ decay carries undetected energy, the $WZ\rightarrow l\nu ll$ process tends to produce events with higher missing energy than the background processes—aside from $t\bar{t}$ whose $E_T$ distribution is also similarly high valued but is a nearly negligible background. We therefore require $E_T > 25$ GeV.

Lastly, the dominant background remaining after these cuts is SM ZZ production. This motivates two more cuts to require one and only one $Z \rightarrow ll$ candidate in the event. We make a standard $Z$ boson identification cut by requiring events to have a pair of same-flavor, opposite-signed leptons whose two-lepton mass falls within a window of ±15 GeV/$c^2$ around the $Z$ mass. This removes most of the SM backgrounds with no $Z$ in the final state. We note that this cut reduces $Z\gamma \rightarrow ll\gamma$ events because the dilepton mass would not reconstruct back to the $Z$ when the $\gamma$ is emitted by one of the two leptons. In that case, the two-lepton mass underestimates the $Z$ mass because the three-body ($ll\gamma$) mass is what reconstructs the $Z$.

To further reduce the $ZZ\rightarrow llll$ background, we reject any event with an extra track with $p_T > 8$ GeV/$c$, thereby rejecting events that may have a fourth lepton that failed to be identified. This cut reduces the remaining ZZ background by $\sim 36\%$ while leaving the WZ signal contribution essentially unchanged. Even so, ZZ remains the primary background in this measurement.

There are several SM processes that result in a similar final state to WZ and are backgrounds in this measurement. The aforementioned $ZZ\rightarrow llll$ process appears as a background when one of the four leptons fails to be reconstructed by the detector. This leaves three reconstructed leptons with the one lepton failing reconstruction providing the missing energy signature. Drell–Yan events produced in association with hadronic jets that mimic the signature of a third lepton as well as Drell–Yan pairs produced with an associated photon that converts to an electron–positron pair via interaction with the detector are also significant backgrounds. Lastly, top quark pair production ($t\bar{t}\rightarrow W^+bW^-\bar{b}$) provides a minor contribution to the background when one of the subsequent $b$-quark jets mimics a lepton signature. The sum of these four backgrounds is quite small compared to the expected signal in the signal kinematics region.

The background modeling—with the exception of the $Z +$ jets background—is Monte Carlo simulated. Events from WZ, ZZ, and $t\bar{t}$ are simulated using the PYTHIA [15] generator. The $Z\gamma$ background is determined using the generator described in Ref. [16]. The response of the CDF II detector is modeled with a GEANT3-based simulation [17] program. The expected yields for each process are normalized to the cross sections calculated at partial next-to-next-to-leading order ($t\bar{t}$ [18]), next-to-leading order (WZ and ZZ [4]), or leading order with an estimated normalization correction to account for higher orders ($Z\gamma$ [16]). Efficiency corrections for the simulated detector response to lepton candidates are determined using samples of observed $Z \rightarrow l^+l^-$ events. The $Z +$ jets background normalization is calculated using the probability that a hadronic jet will be reconstructed as a lepton candidate (the same as is done in CDF’s $H \rightarrow WW$ search [2]), which is measured in independent jet-triggered data samples. These probabilities are applied to the jets in the $Z +$ jets data sample to estimate the number of such events that will pass the lepton identification and signal selection criteria. The expected signal and background contributions are given in Table I along with the observed number of events.

The dominant systematic uncertainties on the estimated contributions come from the luminosity measurement (6%) [19] and the simulated acceptances of the signal and background processes. The acceptance uncertainty due to the parton distribution function modeling ranges from 2.1% to 2.7% for the various processes. A 10% uncertainty is assigned to WZ and ZZ processes for the kinematic differences between leading-order and higher-order calculations. The cross section uncertainty is 6% on the ZZ process, 7% on $t\bar{t}$, and 5% on $Z\gamma$. The $Z\gamma$ process has another 20% uncertainty that accounts for possible mismodeling of the rate at which the $\gamma$ is misidentified as a lepton. Similarly, there is a 25% (23%) uncertainty for $Z +$ jets ($t\bar{t}$) for mismodeling the rate at which light jets (b jets) are misidentified as a lepton. The uncertainty for the modeling of lepton identification is 2% and of trigger efficiencies is 5.4%. Lastly, uncertainties for overall rates for the modeling of jets accounts for 1.2%.

Within the signal kinematic region, we seek to further isolate the signal from background by utilizing a NeuroBayes neural network treatment [3]. In general, the benefits of using a neural network (NN) over a simple

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\begin{tabular}{|l|l|l|}
\hline
Process & Events & Uncertainty \\
\hline
$ZZ$ & 3.6 & ± 0.5 \\
$Z +$ jets & 3.4 & ± 0.8 \\
$Z\gamma$ & 0.8 & ± 0.3 \\
$t\bar{t}$ & 0.1 & ± 0.04 \\
Total background & 7.9 & ± 1.0 \\
WZ & 47.4 & ± 4.8 \\
Total expected & 55.3 & ± 4.9 \\
Data & 63 & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\caption{Expected number of signal (WZ) and background events along with the total number of expected and observed events in the data. Uncertainties include all systematic uncertainties described in the text.}
\end{table}
counting experiment are twofold: it can better isolate the signal from the background and provide a single distribution from which the cross section value can be extracted by fitting the data to the shape of the expected physical processes. We train a neural network with a combination of background events and simulated signal events. The input variables for the NN are kinematic quantities selected to exploit differences between signal and background distributions. Starting with many quantities that show relatively small differences in the distributions of backgrounds and signal, a neural network will assign a numerical score whose distribution for backgrounds and signal will be better separated than in any single input quantity alone. The \( \xi_T \) is a very useful input quantity for the NN because the \( W \to t\bar{t} \) decay in the signal yields a \( \xi_T \) distribution with higher values than the backgrounds. Similarly, the azimuthal angle distribution between the \( W \) lepton and the \( \xi_T \) is useful for distinguishing WZ from the backgrounds because they do not contain \( W \) decays. The total energy transverse to the beam line deposited by the WZ decay compared to that of background processes and lepton flavor combinations (\( eee, eep, e\mu \) track, etc.) are also examples of NN input variables used. Figure 1 shows the output of the NN treatment, with backgroundlike events in simulation and data trending toward a value of \(-1\) while signal-like events trend toward \(+1\). Note that \( t\bar{t} \) is represented in Fig. 1, but has too small of a contribution to be visible.

The measured cross section for WZ is extracted from the NN output in Fig. 1 with a binned maximum likelihood fit method. The likelihood function is formed from a product of Poisson probabilities for each bin in the NN output, and Gaussian constraints are applied corresponding to each systematic uncertainty:

\[
\mathcal{L} = \left( \prod_i \frac{\mu_i^{n_i} e^{-\mu_i}}{n_i!} \right) \cdot \prod_c e^{(-S_c/2)},
\]

where \( \mu_i \) is the total expectation in the \( i \)th bin, \( n_i \) is the number of data events in the \( i \)th bin, and \( S_c \) is a floating parameter associated with the systematic uncertainty \( c \). The \( \mu_i \) parameter is given by

\[
\mu_i = \sum_k \left( \frac{\sigma_{measured}^{(k)}}{\sigma_{expected}^{(k)}} \right) \left[ \prod_c (1 + f_c^{(k)} S_c) \right] (N^{(k)}_{expected}),
\]

The sum \( k \) is over the five processes (one signal and four background) that can contribute to events in bin \( i \), and \( f_c^{(k)} \) is the fractional uncertainty for the process \( k \) due to the systematic uncertainty \( c \). Some systematic uncertainties are common to more than one process and so are correlated. These correlations are accounted for in the definition of \( \mu_i \) through the \( f_c^{(k)} \) parameters. The \( (N^{expected}_{k}) \) is the expected number of events from process \( k \) in the \( i \)th bin. All the background processes are constrained to their SM expectations by setting the proportion of measured to expected cross section to unity. The likelihood is then maximized with respect to the floating systematic \( (S_c) \) and cross section proportion \( (\sigma_{measured}/\sigma_{expected})_{WZ} \) parameters, where \( \sigma_{expected} \) is the expected signal cross section and \( \sigma_{measured} \) is the WZ cross section ultimately measured from the data. This method gives a measured value for the WZ cross section of \( \sigma(p\bar{p} \to WZ) = 3.93^{+0.60}_{-0.53} \text{(stat)}^{+0.59}_{-0.46} \text{(syst)} \) pb, which is in good agreement with the aforementioned standard model prediction of \( 3.50 \pm 0.21 \) [4,5].

The shape and normalization of the \( p_T \) spectrum of the Z boson (Fig. 2) are used to place limits on anomalous TGCs. The most general modification of the WWZ vertex preserving \( C \) and \( P \) separately is parametrized by \( \lambda_Z, g_\gamma^Z, \) and \( \kappa_Z \) [20]. In the SM, \( \lambda_Z = \Delta g_\gamma^Z = \Delta \kappa_Z = 0 \) where \( \Delta g_\gamma^Z \) and

![FIG. 1 (color online). The NN output for discriminating the WZ signal events from background processes within the selected signal sample. Note that the \( t\bar{t} \) contribution is small enough to not be visible. The processes are stacked.](image1)

![FIG. 2 (color online). The Z \( p_T \) distributions for data compared to the SM expectation for signal (WZ) and background. Also presented is how the signal expectation would change with the introduction of anomalous couplings near the observed limits. The processes are stacked.](image2)
\( \Delta \kappa_Z \) are used to denote the deviations of \( g_1^Z \) and \( \kappa_Z \) from their SM values. In general, the parameters \( \lambda_Z, \Delta g_1^Z, \) and \( \Delta \kappa_Z \) can be functions of the invariant mass \( \sqrt{s} \) of the WZ system. Nonzero values of \( \lambda_Z, g_1^Z, \) and \( \kappa_Z \) at large \( \sqrt{s} \) violate unitarity. To avoid this, each coupling is modified by a form factor \( \alpha(s) = \frac{\alpha_0}{1 + \frac{s}{\Lambda^2}} \), where \( \alpha_0 \) is the unmodified coupling \( \lambda_Z, g_1^Z, \) or \( \kappa_Z \).

The likelihood of the Z \( p_T \) distribution for various anomalous TGC models is used to set limits. The expected Z \( p_T \) distribution for a given TGC before the effect of the detector response is obtained using MC@NLO [4]. The detector acceptance and efficiency are modeled by multiplying the MCFM distribution by a Z \( p_T \)-dependent factor. This factor is calculated using six different simulated event samples generated at different TGC values with the full detector response simulated by GEANT3. The TGC values are chosen to be in the parameter space near the existing limits. For each sample, the product of acceptance and efficiency is extracted from the simulation as a ratio of the reconstructed and generated yields. These ratios are averaged together as a function of Z \( p_T \) using the maximum variation as an estimate of the uncertainty due to assuming the efficiency and acceptance are not dependent on the TGC values.

A likelihood for each of the couplings, \( L(\lambda_Z), L(\Delta g_1^Z), \) and \( L(\Delta \kappa_Z) \), is computed as a product of the Poisson probability of each of the bins of the Z \( p_T \) distribution for the assumed anomalous coupling. Then 95% confidence levels are set where \((-2 \ln L) - (-2 \ln L_{\text{min}}) = (1.96)^2\). The systematic uncertainties include everything considered for the WZ cross section and the additional \( p_T \)-dependent uncertainty on the efficiency, which ranges from 5% to 20%. Systematic uncertainties are implemented in a way that most reduces the TGC limit sensitivity when fluctuating the signal and background by 1 standard deviation, thereby taking a conservative approach in assigning systematic uncertainty. The observed 95% confidence level limits are consistent with expectations as shown in Table II.

To summarize, the WZ production cross section has been measured in pp collisions at \( \sqrt{s} = 1.96 \) TeV from reconstructed events in the trilepton plus \( E_T \) final state using a likelihood ratio formed from a NeuroBayes neural network distribution that discriminates signal from background. This result, \( \sigma(pp \to WZ) = 3.93^{+0.62}\text{(stat)}^{+0.59}\text{(syst)} \) pb, is the most precise measurement at this energy with an overall uncertainty of less than 20% and in agreement with SM predictions. The same event sample is also used to perform the most sensitive probe to date at this energy of anomalous WWZ couplings. The Z \( p_T \) distribution of the sample is found to be in agreement with the SM expectation and is used to place limits on anomalous triple-gauge couplings.
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